

1760
i-

THE
NUMBER
OF THE
BEAST,

Clearly counted,
In his own proper Numerals,
And applied.

LUKE viii. 16, 17.
No man when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed: but setteth it on a candlestick, that they which enter in may see the light.

For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest: neither any thing hid, that shall not be known, and come abroad.

L O N D O N :

Printed for the A U T H O R,

And sold by H. SLATER, the Corner of Clare-Court, in
Drury-Lane. 1760.

MS. See Nat. Displ. Vol. V. Dial. And
Gent. Magyar 1758. P. 124. — Medes
Workes, p. 880 —

Harvard College Library
Coolidge Fund
October 25, 1939

ERRATA.

PAGE 10, Line 5. for *Furiou*, read *Jurieu*. Page
28. L. 25. for *in*, read *is*. P. 30. L. 7. for *C*,
read, *O*. Page 31. Line 2. for *C*, read *O*. Page 32.
L. 19. for *numerical* read *numeral*.

THE
 AUTHOR'S APOLOGY
 FOR THIS
 PUBLICATION.

THAT I presume to offer this to the Publick, is not owing to any ambition that I have to shew myself as an Author. I am very sensible that when I have used my best endeavour, I am by far too incorrect a writer to appear in Print to any advantage: and to make an awkward figure in the face of the world, is not, I think, worth aspiring after. But when the thought that is here conveyed, was suggested to my mind, it seemed to me to cast such a clear light upon that very dark and mysterious passage of Holy Writ to which it refers, that I imagin'd the communicating it might be doing a service to the Church of God, and would be

especially acceptable to every Protestant : and this has emboldened me to commit it to the Press, tho' destitute of the embellishments that may be necessary to recommend it to the Public acceptance. The Ingenious Reader, therefore, must not look for much Accuracy or Elegance in this performance; but is desired only to give his attention to the Substance of what is here delivered, if I am happy enough to write so as to be understood; and if he finds that to answer to the purpose for which it is intended, it is humbly hoped that he will be so good as to pass over the faults and imperfections that may be observed in the stile and manner of it: and he may assure himself that if I could have set it off in a neater and better dress, so as to have rendered it more agreeable to him, I should have been very glad to oblige Him and Myself in it.

THE

THE
 N U M B E R
 OF THE
 B E A S T,
 CLEARLY COUNTED, &c.

A REVEREND doctor, that in his time made no inconsiderable figure in the church, has, upon some occasion, represented the study of the book of the Revelation as either the mere effect of madness, or a certain cause of it.

But the wisest men may sometimes be guilty of rash and indiscreet expressions. The book we are speaking of, is acknowledged to have been indited by the spirit of God, and I suppose it was not the doctor's design

design to deny it ; and then the same spirit expressly testifies concerning it, that ** blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy* : and can it be consistent with this to say, that the man must be mad that applies himself to it with diligent attention, or that this will be sure to make him so ?

It is true, those who have taken in hand to explain the mysterious prophecies of this book, have many times gone beyond their depth, and launched out into great extravagances. But what then ? is this any proof that there is no such thing as searching into it with humility and modesty ? The censure certainly is (to say no worse of it) too severe.

Nevertheless it may very probably happen, that a great many will, upon the doctor's authority, at once condemn this attempt of mine to explain a passage of that book, that has always been esteemed as difficult perhaps as any in it ; and without examining what I have to say, may forthwith conclude me to be out of my senses for meddling with it. But I flatter myself that those who will give themselves the trouble to read what I here offer, will find nothing in it but what is rational and easy, no wild conceits to countenance the suspicion of any disorder. One thing at least I may venture to affirm, *viz.* that

that the study of this book has not disorderd me; for I never did LABOUR in the study of it.

Yet I do not mean that I have neglected this more than any other part of holy scripture; nor has my reading it been without some serious consideration of the several matters therein treated of; but *en passant*, and without any very close application to it: and the explanation that I am going to offer, came into my thoughts quite beside my expectation.

That by the beast in the beginning of cap. 13. of this book, is meant the city and state of heathen Rome, seems very evident from the description there given of it; especially as the vision is explained to St. John himself in the 17th chapter. And if by the kings, in ver. 10. of that 17th chapter, be understood the different forms of government that the Romans were sometimes under, there will, I suppose, be very little difficulty in applying the whole that is said of it to them: Their kings, consuls, decemvirs, tribunes and dictators were all fallen, the government by them was at an end; and the emperors then were, that was the form they were then under: and if it be remembered, that in after times the empire, which had been used to have but one, came to be governed

verned by two emperors, this may not unfitly be supposed to be intended by the other that was not yet come. And tho' this form of government took place a great while before the final destruction of that empire; yet if it be considered how frequently it was interrupted, and that when one was taken out of the way, the other often continued to rule alone, it may, I conceive, be properly enough said, that this government continued but a short space, as in the latter part of the verse it is foretold it should; especially if it be supposed to refer (as there may be some reason to think) only to the times before the emperors became christian. But whether the state of papal Rome be meant by the second beast, cap. xiii. ver. 11, that came up with two horns like a lamb (which clearly corresponds to the eighth head or kingdom in the 11th verse of the 13th chapter) it may perhaps be thought by some not so prudent to be too positive in determining: however, I must need say, that to me the marks have always seemed to be very conspicuous.

But this is not the point that I am directly concerned at present to make good: that which I propose is to count the number of this beast, which the apostle, cap. xiii. ver. 18. tells us, is six hundred threescore and six.

What

What this number refers to, or where and in what manner it is to be searched after, has always been matter of great doubt and difficulty, and various have been mens opinions concerning it, and the schemes that have been offered for the clearing of it up. But that which seemed to me to bid the fairest for it, was the opinion of those who imagined that it refers to, and must be found in the name of the beast, as having this very probable argument (as I was used to think it) on its side, that the apostle in the preceding verse and elsewhere, styles it the number of his name. And when numbers were marked by letters of the alphabet or some of them, as was very plainly the case amongst the ancient Greeks and Romans, and it is said, the Jews also, and perhaps anciently in most other nations, it might be very possible that the letters of a name or names being considered in their numeral capacities, might make up exactly this number. This therefore put men upon searching after words that contained as many of those numerals as would do this.

And amongst the rest one of the ancient fathers pitched upon the word *λατεις*, which seems clearly enough expressive of the Roman people, as answering to this purpose: and it is certain that the letters of that word

B

being

being taken as Greek numerals, and added together, the sum total of them is the very number sought. And this scheme has been adopted by some of the moderns also. And I learn from Mr. Pyle, that Furieu and Dabuz pretend that the Hebrew name of Rome contains also the same number in the Hebrew numerals: but for my part I am not enough versed in the Hebrew to know whether it be so or not. However, taking it for granted that they have advanced nothing, but what is evident to those who understand the Hebrews manner of computation, I have often wondered how it should happen, that there should be two words, (tho' in different languages) so plainly expressing that city and people, the letters of which, in their use as numerals, should amount to the very number here spoken of. And I confess it appeared so extraordinary to me, as being what I suppose is not to be equalled in any names of any other people whatsoever, that I was well inclined to think, that this really was what was intended.

But still there was something that stuck with me. The Hebrew name of Rome was not the proper name of it, but somewhat else in stead thereof, *viz.* a name appropriated to it by another people. And tho' *λατεινος* may be truly said to be a Roman word, yet to find this number in it, it must be made
Greek,

Greek, and then the spelling differs a little from what it is in the Latin. And besides, tho' the number be indeed found in those words, yet if Rome be the beast, it certainly is not the number of the beast; for the Romans never made use of those letters in their computations. And it is observable that when the apostle bids us count the number, he tells us it is the number of a man, or as I think it should rather be rendered, the man, that is the beast, for he probably means it of the men to whom he gives the appellation of the beast. There is an expression very like this in cap. xxi. of this book, ver. 17, where speaking of the angel that was measuring the holy city, he says, that he measured the wall thereof an hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man; which expression he immediately explains by saying, that is, of the angel, of whom he was then speaking. By a man therefore is there plainly meant the person that was just spoken of, tho' he was not properly a man but an angel. And as the expression here is clearly parallel, and the language of the same apostle, 'tis reasonable to interpret it in the same manner, as referring to the beast of whom he was speaking. I suppose therefore that this was designed to intimate, that the number was to be found in the proper numbers of the beast, and consequently that finding

in the numerals of other nations, was not the thing that was intended.

I was therefore used to think, that it would be much more to the purpose, if there could be found any Roman words expressive of that people, that contained as many of the Roman numerals as would make up that number.

And one day as I was musing on this, I purposed with myself to try whether I could not find out some such. And in order to this, the first thing I had to do, was to consider what, and how many of those numerals would be sufficient for the purpose: and in examining into this, I soon found (indeed almost unawares to me, and to my very great surprize) that all together answered to it exactly. And when I had discovered this, I sought no more after words that contained those numerals, as thinking that this itself was much more to the purpose, as I shall have occasion to shew particularly anon.*

At first, indeed, I considered D as the Roman mark for five hundred, and then I was under a necessity of taking in M for a thousand; and so the total amount of the numerals was one thousand six hundred threescore and six. With regard to which, it was indeed suggested to me by a friend, that

* Page 33, &c.

that it was not M that was the old mark for a thousand, but two D's turned towards each other, and joined together thus (Ϟ) ; and that therefore there would be no need to take notice of that character, since that was nothing else but the former one doubled. But besides that I do apprehend, that this was the old way of writing M, and sure I am that in some very old books I have seen it printed in that manner, or very like it; and our dictionaries, when they speak of it as a numeral, seem to confirm this opinion: besides this I say, Ϟ is clearly a distinct single character, and is really as different from D, as X is from V: for this likewise may seem to be made by the joining of two V's set one above the other, with their points turned towards each other: and therefore whether it be M or not, it must be looked upon as a new numeral; and upon this supposition, all their numerals must, as I said, amount to a thousand more than the number given.

But I soon recollected that M was not the only way, if it was at all the ancient manner of noting a thousand; one very common mark, at least, of this being CIO. And this brought it also into my mind, that neither was D the only mark for five hundred, but that was often expressed by IO; and it may perhaps seem that this was the true original way

way of writing it, and that the D was formed only by extending the horns of the O so as to join it to the I.

But because the stress of my whole plan rests upon this, it may be proper to examine it a little more distinctly. For it may be thought that the original characters were D and M, or ∞ , and that IO and CIO were only corruptions of those; and then it may be said, that these are not the proper characters.

And that either those or the others were corruptions, may indeed be thought not very unlikely. As the Romans had very few numerals in all, it is scarce imaginable that they should at first have two different ones for the same number. And those approach so near to one another, that it is easy to conceive that one might be corruptly formed out of the other of them; and if one or the other were corruptions, the searching out which were the most ancient, is no doubt the right way to discern which are the proper characters.

Now the surest way of tracing this out, may perhaps be by inscriptions upon ancient coins, or medals, or the like: but what can be proved from hence concerning it I know not, being very little acquainted with any matters of this kind. All I can do, is to argue from what is probable; and the probability,

bability, I think, seems to lie on the side of IO and CIO.

For on the supposition that those were the original writing, it is easy to account for the corruption: IO might naturally enough, thro' inadvertency, thro' hurry, or mistake of the writer, or the like, be made D; and in like manner ∞ might be wrote for CIO: and tho' persons of understanding would easily see the error, yet it might be natural enough for them to acquiesce in it: the change being thus made into letters of the alphabet, they were rendered more conformable to their other numerals, which were all such; and therefore a great many might approve the new characters, and be forward in the use of them. Or without any mistake at all, some might take a fancy to make such alteration, that so their numerals might be all of the same sort: and when once it was begun, it is easy to suppose there would be many followers.

But I conceive it is much more difficult to account for the change of D and ∞ into IO and CIO. Indeed if IO had been the mark of five hundred, and ∞ of a thousand; or if D had been for five hundred, and CIO for a thousand; the change of the single letter would seem natural enough, as it might be supposed to be, in order to render it more conformable to the other character.

But

But as this is not likely, so it is never supposed to have been the case : and if both D and ∞ was the original use, it may seem not so easy to say how the change could have been brought about. When all their numerals were letters of the alphabet (as upon this supposition they must have been), one would be apt to think (at least upon the face of it) that it could not be by design, that those uncouth characters were thrust in to supplant the D and ∞ . And then I think we cannot impute it to the ignorance of the scribes : for when all the numerals were letters of the alphabet, what ignorance could make them imagine that it was not D and ∞ , but some out-of-the-way figures somewhat like them, that were the marks for five hundred and a thousand ? And as little reason have we to think, that carelessness or hurry might introduce the change : tho' this might occasion men to write D and ∞ , two well known letters, for IO and CIO ; yet I do not think it likely it should make them separate the parts of the D and ∞ , so as to make two or three distinct characters of them ; especially that they should do it in this instance only, as they are numerals.

But if either of those might have happened, yet the change must have been in some measure approved, before it could have crept into common use : and as the blunder was such

such as every one would be able to correct, unless some probable reason can be assigned, why they should approve the alteration, it cannot sure seem likely that such a corruption should have taken place by this means. It is certainly, therefore, more easy to account for the change of IO and CIO, into D and ω ; and therefore, I suppose, more probable that IO and CIO were the original characters, and D and ω corruptions of them.

And agreeable to this seem to be the sentiments of our common lexicographers. In Gouldman's dictionary, at the letter D, which is mentioned as the note of five hundred, it is added, *Sed non D, verum duæ hæ notæ IO, signif. quingenta, pro quibus Imperiti D scripserunt.* Mr. Ainsworth, at the letter D, says, *The numeral note of one thousand being CIO, the half thereof is IO, which, for quicker writing drawn close together, makes D: And again, under the letter M, he says, M in numerals is one thousand from the first letter of Mille, according to Priscian; but with more probability from this ancient mark CIO, which by the negligence or ignorance of transcribers, was drawn together and made ω , the half of which, D, from hence stands for five hundred.* In the Cambridge dictionary, 'tis said, ω ; *mille denotat, quod forte debeat ortum depravationi hujusce figure CIO, describentium Incuria factæ.* And Dr. Lyttleton takes notice
of

of it as a common opinion, that *ex CIO conjunctis coaluit* ∞ ; and I think there must be the same, if not more reason to conclude that *ex IO conjunctis coaluit* D. For ∞ being the first letter of the word *mille*, might have been set down sometimes for a thousand; not as a numeral character, but instead of the word *mille*, it being usual with the Romans, in innumerable instances, to put the first letter of a word to stand for the whole of it, and from thence it might come by degrees to be used as a numeral, without deriving it from CIO. But there could be no such reason for the use of D for five hundred; and therefore if that was not itself the original character, it must have been made by the joining together of IO; unless we would rather suppose, that when ∞ came to be used as a numeral character for a thousand, D was taken, as one half of that character, to signify one half of that number.

But it may be said, if it be easier to account for the corruption into D and ∞ , yet it is certainly more difficult to assign any reason for the use of IO and CIO, otherwise than by supposing them to be corruptions from the others: for when all the preceding numerals were letters of the alphabet, must it not be most natural to suppose, that originally they made use of such throughout?
And

And what can make us imagine it likely, that they should here turn aside from their own Plan, to make use of a different sort of character?

In answer to this it may be said, that perhaps their numerals are not all of the same antiquity: at first they might have had no character to mark any number greater than an hundred, which might too have been very sufficient for almost all the uses of a rustick people, not yet skilled in literature, nor acquainted with commerce. And when I, V, X, L and C, were by long use become their established numerals, the person who first ventured to use a particular character for five hundred, might possibly think it would be less liable to exception, if he some way or other applied some of the old standing numerals to this purpose, than if he was to add any new ones to them; and therefore taking C, the old character for an hundred, and (a) turning it backwards, and so making a new character of the same letter, and putting I, that in the old count stood for one, before it, set that to signify five hundred.

And if what Mr. Gouldman remarks under the letter C, was really an usage of great antiquity, viz. that in the notes of the ancients, as C stood for *Caius*, so Ɔ was the note for *Caia*, their inverting this letter upon this occasion may seem easy to be ac-

C 2 counted

(a) being the first letter of *Centum* -

counted for; for it is no more than they were sometimes used to do, when it was necessary for distinction sake: and therefore when they wanted to set down five hundred in a shorter way than by CCCCC, and yet scrupled to make use of another letter for that purpose, it might be natural for them to take the inverted C, that is C , which was used by way of distinction upon another occasion (as being the same letter, only turned backward) and for greater difference putting I before it, apply that to express this number. And when this was brought into use, CIC was easy to be formed from hence to the note of a thousand.

It must be confessed that this is only guess work, and I know of no authority to support it: but while the difficulty of accounting for the corruption of D and m into ID and CIC , seems to intimate, that ID and CIC were probably the original marks, I conceive it is not at all absurd, to admit of a mere conjecture, that gives an easy and rational account, how they might come to be so.

But there has another reason occurred to me for their use of ID and CIC , which perhaps may be more satisfactory, and that is, that they might be able to mark larger numbers with the greater ease. However unskilled the Romans may be supposed to have been in the beginning of their state, in the
more

more flourishing times of it they were a polite and learned people, and wanted not able masters in all the parts of good literature, and amongst the rest in mathematical learning, where the knowledge of numbers is of especial use, and in which very large numbers are often wanted to be set down. Now if in order to do this they had pursued the same method in which they began, *viz.* by letters of the alphabet, they must either have had new characters as often as their plan required it, or must have expressed every thing by repetitions of the former ones. If they had made choice of the first of those, it must have greatly encreased their numerals; for there must not only have been new characters for five hundred and a thousand, but also for five thousand and ten thousand, for fifty thousand and a hundred thousand, for five hundred thousand and a million, and so on, till in short there would be no end. But how contrary this would have been to the genius of the Romans in this particular, is very evident, it being clearly their aim to have as few different characters as possible, and in fact they made use of fewer than perhaps any other nation in the world: in counting to a hundred they used but five, whereas the Greeks used no less than nineteen in the same space. This scheme therefore, as it never

ver was adopted by them, so neither could it have been agreeable to their taste.

If then they had taken the other course of repeating the former characters, it must have made their numeration most intolerably prolix, which is too much so as it is. What a business it would have been to have forty, or perhaps a hundred M's to express so many thousands? and what could have been done when they were to mark yet greater numbers? It would at least have destroyed one chief intention of numeral characters, which is, to set down numbers in a shorter manner than by words, would have rendered it troublesome and difficult to count the numbers, and instead of assisting, must have been a clog to their arithmetical operations.

But by pitching upon IO and CIO, they found as easy and short a way of setting down the largest numbers, as could have been contrived on such a plan as theirs was. For as IO stood for five hundred, and CIO for a thousand, so, according to Mr. Gouldman, IOO was five thousand, and CCIOO ten thousand, IOOO fifty thousand, and CCCIOOO a hundred thousand, and so they might have gone on *ad infinitum*; it being only requisite at those fives, that according to their plan required a new numeral, to cast off all the C's, and to add a O after the I to those that were already used; and when they advanced

advanced to the respective tens, to put as many C's before those IO's, as there were O's after the I for the preceding fives.

The departing therefore here from their former method of counting by letters of the alphabet, was a prudent contrivance, and shewed the superiority of their judgment, inasmuch as it enabled them to set down the greatest numbers, in a more ready and obvious manner than they could have done in the other way. And therefore also it seems to have been the effect of their riper knowledge: an ignorant people might perhaps want to have a few characters, to express some common numbers; but a method to set down easily the greatest numbers, was not likely to be sought after, till the knowledge of letters had taught men the use they might have of such: and therefore, however the former characters might have been in use perhaps from the beginning of their state, yet this seems to me an argument, that IO and CIO at least, by the help of which they made their numeration perfect, were not taken into the numerals, till their diving into the liberal arts brought them to see this to be necessary.

But here it must be confessed, that if D and M were in use with them before (which whether they were or not, or indeed whether they had any numerals till all were established

blished together, is more than I can pretend to say; but if they had, and if D and ∞ were of the number, then I say, that) this might not unlikely give occasion to the altering them into IO and CIO, the very thing which I have hitherto supposed so difficult to account for: for when the letters would not answer their purpose of setting down very large numbers, and they saw how easily it might be compassed by separating the parts of them, they might make no scruple to do this; which therefore I cannot say, but it might possibly be the foundation of the use of those characters.

But if this was the case, then IO and CIO are not corruptions of the letters, but improvements on them; it was then upon mature deliberation that the former were rejected, and those taken into their place upon account of their greater usefulness. The others therefore were from thenceforward become as it were antiquated and obsolete, and tho' they might continue to be now and then made use of, yet the best allowed, approved and established numerals were IO and CIO; which is more to the purpose of proving them to be the proper characters, than if they had been indeed the most ancient.

But if IO and CIO are only the parts of D and ∞ separated for more convenient use, does not this make those letters to be truly the

the characters that are still used? To which I answer, that I think not; the letter D seems to be compounded of the letter I and a C inverted, or O ; and so O of C and I and O ; but before they are joined together they are not those letters; it is the joining of them that makes them such; and therefore when they are separated they plainly cease to be so, and return again to be, the one I and O , and the other C and I and O .

But what if IO and CIO was the more ancient way of writing D and O ? must not this determine it to be those letters that are used under this form? To which I answer, that I apprehend there are not any where the least footsteps of this, nor any thing to ground such an imagination on; and without some foundation for it, I think it would be absurd to suppose, that they put two or three distinct characters to make up one letter. But if it had been so at first, yet since that use was entirely lost, and yet the numbers continued to be marked in this manner, it is plain that those notes could not then be looked upon as those letters, but only as other arbitrary marks to express those numbers.

But tho' I think it would be more clearly to the purpose, if it could be certainly concluded that those were either the original, or the most approved and settled marks of
D
those

those numbers, nevertheless if it must at last remain uncertain whether they were so or not, or even if it should be determined that they were not so, yet if IO and CIO were used, this I conceive will be sufficient, as will be shewn in another place *. And I think there can be no doubt of the use of them. Those who are versed in the writings of the ancient grammarians, may very possibly fetch from thence proofs of it that would be unexceptionable. But as to myself, I must confess that this is a part of literature, that I am as little conversant in, as in coins and medals: and here in the country I can have no opportunity of searching into those authors, to see whether they have said any thing of it or not. But in the mean time it seems to be universally acknowledged that they were used. In our printed books they are very commonly set down as Roman numerals, which could never have happened, if they had not been as commonly esteemed so to be. And our dictionaries not only confess the use of them, but, as I observed before, generally suppose them to have been the true and original marks: and the least that can be inferred from hence is, that the writers of those dictionaries thought it a very certain thing that they were used, and very commonly, or else one would imagine,

imagine, they could never have fancied them to be the original characters.

And when those are the marks for five hundred and a thousand, the sum of their numerals will be found to be exactly according to the number of the beast, six hundred sixty and six.

For CIO, the mark of a thousand, is not a new, but a compounded character; being in respect of its notation wholly made up of C, the mark for an hundred, and IO, the mark for five hundred. There may seem however to be this new in it, that it does not signify according to the ordinary notation of the Romans in other instances. For in their computations a smaller number set before a greater, does elsewhere note the subtraction of the smaller from the greater: thus I before V signifies one less than five, that is four; and X before L, ten less than fifty, that is, forty: and according to this rule, C before IO, that is CIO, would note one hundred less than five hundred, that is four hundred: but contrary to this CIO is always the mark of a thousand, and four hundred is noted CCCC. In respect of the intention therefore it may seem to be new, tho' not in the notation. But when we come more closely to consider the intention, it will, I suppose, be found to be no more new there than in the

notation : for CIO is very plainly double the quantity of IO, and therefore was probably intended for two of them : and the horns of the two C's being thus set in opposition to one another, was in their intention as much as to say two IO's, or twice five hundred. And if X was made up of two V's, as was before supposed, it will follow, that to take two of the same characters, and to set them one against the other in an inverted manner, was not a new way with them to note the double quantity : and all the difference is, that there the two are joined together, but here they are kept separate. In no sense therefore can CIO be said to be a new character, in the notation, it is plainly two former characters put together, C and IO ; and in the intention, agreeably to what seems to have been elsewhere used by them, it stands for two IO's.

And as there is no new character in CIO, so neither is there any thing new in IO, but the O only ; which therefore might seem to be more especially the note of five hundred ; the I being exactly the same as in the mark of number one. But why they set the I before the O in the notation of this number, it may perhaps not be so easy to determine. For whether this character was first formed by dissolving the D, or by arbitrarily taking the first and last of the foregoing numerals, and turning

turning the C backwards, and changing the place of the I, (putting it before, whereas its place is always after the greater numbers, except that it is sometimes set before V or X, to note the subtraction of one from those numbers) which way soever, I say, the character was first formed, one would think it would have been more agreeable to their scheme, to have omitted the I: O by itself was sufficiently distinguished from all the other characters, and then, as all their other prime numerals were single characters, it may seem odd that this should be made to consist of two. But I suppose the case was, that this being intended as the basis on which they were to raise all the greater numerals, they set I before it, to be as it were a bar of separation and distinction between the C's that were to be set before, and the O's that were to come after it, in their notation of the greater numbers.

But it may be said, if O be only the letter C inverted, then there seems to be nothing at all new in IO, any more than in CIO: for as I is the same as is used for number one, and tho' its place is changed, is yet the same character; so if O be only C inverted, then that is still the same letter as is the mark for an hundred, notwithstanding the transposing of it. But to this it is very easy to answer, that tho' it be the same letter, yet the altering the form

form of it makes it quite a new character: it is not used before in that shape, and tho' it be truly made of C, yet it is no longer properly C, but C inverted; whereas in CIO every one of the characters is the same as was used before in the very same form. I think therefore that C, to which I is always prefixed, may justly be looked upon as a new character, tho' CIO can have no pretensions to be accounted such.

But it may be further objected, that unless two characters being put together, shall be allowed to make a new one, the Roman numerals may be found to be fewer even than we suppose them to be. For according to what has been observed above, X seems to be only two V's reversed, and joined together at the point; and perhaps the same might have been originally the case of L and C, tho' now the angles of the L's are rounded in the C.

In answer to this it is obvious to observe, that however this might have been at first, they are quite distinct characters in the use and notation of them: the V's are quite lost in the X, which is itself as distinct a character as the V; and much more may the same be said of L and C: and if CIO were in like manner joined together, so as to make ∞ , no doubt but it would be a new one, as I have acknowledged above: but
here

here the whole three characters, C, and I, and C, continue quite distinct from each other; and then they can no more be said to constitute a new character than LX, which is formed of those two, L and X, may.

I can think of but one thing more, that can be supposed any way to affect what has been said; and that is, that whereas it has been suggested above, that CIO is in the intention of it two IO's, it may perhaps be asked, Why we may not as well look upon CIO to be the whole new character, and IO to be only set down as half of that? And if this was the case, then it should seem that CIO was to be considered as the proper numeral; and IO being only an imperfect character, a mere half of the other, ought not to be taken notice of.

Now to this it may be answered, that however this be, yet IO is not only the more simple character, but being the smaller number comes first into use; and so before CIO appears all the characters have been already used: and then I think it matters little whether IO be a half character, or CIO a double one; there is nothing in this last, but what has been in use before.

But besides, in the Roman numeration the fives of every sort are still distinguished by a character, that may in like manner seem to be half of that which stands for their respective

pective tens; thus V, the note for five units, seems to be half of X, that stands for ten; and L, the mark for five tens, or fifty, may be thought to be intended for half of C, the note of ten tens, or an hundred. If therefore IO, because it seems to be half of CIO, be an imperfect numeral, and not to be ranked amongst the others, then for the same reason V and L must be so too: but if notwithstanding this, those are rightly reckoned distinct whole characters, then so ought IO also. But if this be admitted, then CIO must be excluded from the number of their single numerals, as being after this a mere compound, as was said before, made up of two or three of the foregoing characters, and in its intention signifying two IO's.

But however, this is evident, that beyond an hundred they had no new numerical character but O: which alone, or rather according to common use, with I before it, signified five hundred.

 Their single numerals therefore were I one, V five, X ten, L fifty, C an hundred, O or IO five hundred; by the compositions of which, subtractions, and additions, all their other numbers were framed. And if those are all placed together in their due order, beginning with the greatest number first, and going on gradually to the least, thus IO C L X V I; or, which is the same thing, if

if the numbers which each of them singly, was intended to express, be all added together, *viz.*

I	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
V	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
X	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
L	-	-	-	-	-	-	50
C	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
D	-	-	-	-	-	-	500

They make up exactly the number six hundred, threescore, and six.

And thus I think it appears beyond all exception, that the sum total of the numeral letters of the Romans, in this manner of their counting, answers fully to that which the Apostle tells us is the number of the beast.

And this being so, there will not, I suppose, be need of many words to shew, that those numerals are very probably the thing which he calls by that name. That he does not mean that the people, whom he terms the beast, should be exactly six hundred, threescore, and six in number, and no more, I presume will be very readily allowed; and if this be out of the question, I know of nothing that can be so reasonably called the

E

number

number of a people, as the whole of their numerals. It is well known to be a very usual thing to give the name of numbers to those marks or figures that are set to signify numbers : the numerals of any people therefore are their numbers, the numbers which they use ; and then all their numerals together make their compleat number, as containing every number that is made use of in their computations. It is therefore their number by way of eminence, being their entire numeration table, as I may call it ; and I must need say, that for my own part, I do not see what else can so properly lay claim to this title.

But if this be rightly called the number of a people, then I think the presumption will appear to be very strong, that those Roman numerals are what the Apostle intended by the number of the beast. That by number he understands numerals, can indeed only be inferred from the propriety of the term, or its aptness to signify thus, especially as this may seem to be confirmed by the exact agreement of the Roman numerals to the description given of it. But if this be the meaning of the word (as it is obvious enough to understand it, and this circumstance may well incline us to think that it was designed), then it must plainly be those numerals that
are

are intended: for if we run thro' all the nations of the world, I do not believe we shall find any other, whose numerals being all added together will make this number. If therefore it be the numerals of some people that is intended by the expression, then the numerals of that people who alone made use of such as answer to the account given of it, must undoubtedly be what is meant by this number.

And moreover, it is very remarkable, that those numerals point in a very particular manner towards the number propounded: for the characters are in all six, two of which are for marking of units, I and V, and added together they make the number six; there are two likewise that note tens, X and L, and those in like manner make sixty; and the other two, C and D, note hundreds, and are together six hundred; and beyond, it is only complications and repetitions of the same characters: and as their units, their tens, and their hundreds, are all counted by sixes, and beyond they had no new characters, one might be almost apt to imagine, that when the Apostle described the beasts number as made up of six hundreds, six tens, and six units, that is, six hundred sixty and six, he must have had this directly in his view.

But besides, the Apostle in the foregoing part of the chapter, and again in the 17th chapter, gives such a description of the beast, as must necessarily carry the eye of every intelligent reader towards the Roman state: and tho' perhaps there might be some difficulties in applying some parts of it to that state, that he could not tell how to reconcile; yet there was clearly nothing that could answer to the description in general, so well as that did: and then, when together with this he sets forth the number of the beast to be six hundred threescore and six, and the numerals of the same people, which at least have a very fair pretension to be called their number, do not only make up exactly that sum, but refer as it were directly to it; What can be more likely than that this is indeed the thing that was intended by it? The case will not admit of a demonstration, but it seems to me to have all the degrees of probability that it can well have.

The only objection that I apprehend it to be liable to, is that this number of the beast is sometimes called also the number of his name: which, as I observed above, may be thought to intimate, that the number was contained in his name. But this, I suppose, can be judged to be but of little weight: the phrase, his name, may be designed to

note

note the people of that name, in which sense it is often used in Holy Writ: thus Moses commands the Jews with regard to the Canaanites, * *that they should destroy their name*; that is, all the inhabitants of that country, *from under heaven*. And so also Isaiah, in his denunciation against Babylon, says, that † *God would cut off from it the name and remnant, and son and nephew*; that is, plainly, the whole people and their posterity. And in like manner, when our Saviour tells his disciples, that ‡ *men would separate them from their company, and cast out their name as evil*, we shall most commodiously understand it of their persons, those who should be called by the name of Christians. And understanding it here in a like sense, the number of his name will mean no more than the number that is used by (or perhaps is peculiar to) the people of that name. And that which hath been propounded, answers very fully unto this: for this way of numbering was not only used by the Romans, but was also peculiar to them, being not known to, nor used by any other nation, but who learned it of them, and used it in compliance with their customs,

And now I suppose it sufficiently appears, as that all the Roman numerals together make

* Deut. vii. 24. † Isa. xiv. 22. ‡ Luk. vi. 22.

make up the number six hundred three score and six ; so that nothing can be more properly called the number of a people, than the whole body of their numerals ; and that therefore, as we have no reason to believe that any other nation in the world made use of numbers that amounted to the same sum, and those seem to bear a particular reference thereto, it must be exceeding probable, that those Roman numerals are what the Apostle means by the number of the beast ; especially as he describes the beast in the beginning of the chapter, and elsewhere, in such a manner as must incline us to look for this number amongst the Roman people.

But as they had also other characters for five hundred and a thousand, and each of them quite new and distinct, it must be confessed, that in respect of those we have not included all their numerals. But as this scheme does clearly comprehend all that they used according to one manner of their counting, and proceed as far as you will in this way of reckoning, you can only repeat the same characters ; this, I suppose, must supercede all necessity of taking in the numerals of any different way of computing : for if it be their whole number in one way, then it may be truly said to be their whole number ; tho' it be not so in respect of another way,

way, that was also in use among them ; but especially, as this was their most perfect way of numbering : in the other way, their numeration was soon at an end ; they could only set down a few thousands there ; but here they could mark as large numbers as they could have any occasion to use, with as much ease as could possibly be upon such a plan. This, therefore, was clearly their most perfect way of counting ; and if it be their whole number in that way, it can surely be no objection against it, that it is not the whole of another more imperfect manner.

And if those numerals are the true count of the beast's number, this (by the way) must be a very convincing argument, that the Roman state is the beast there spoken of. Whatever difficulty there may be, in applying any part of the description of the beast to that state ; yet, if the Roman numerals be the true number of the beast, the Romans must certainly be the beast that is described ; and it rests upon the same degree of probability, as that those numerals are his number. And when the case seems so plain, it is much more reasonable to conclude, that the difficulties which we find in making the application, must arise from our own ignorance, or from some other defect in ourselves, rather than reject the truth that is confirmed to us
by

by such cogent proof, upon the account of those difficulties.

And if the beast be Rome, then the first must be Heathen Rome, with which the description so exactly suits. And then what must we suppose to be the second? 'Tis plain that this also is Rome; it is apparent enough, that the two beasts are but different states of the same people; nay, that which in the 13th chapter is described as another beast with two horns, in the 17th chapter is only the eighth head of the same beast; clearly intimating, as I apprehend, that it was still the same city, only under a different sort of administration. And moreover, it is particularly of this second beast, or eighth head, that the Apostle is speaking, when he mentions this number. 'Tis, therefore, certainly in Rome that we are to look for him also: and if the first was, as I have said, its Heathen state, there seems to remain nothing for the second, but the Papacy. For after the destruction of the empire, I do not find that there was any sovereignty in Rome, 'till the Papal power appeared there. And therefore there can be nothing to make us think that That was not intended, unless the marks are quite repugnant thereto; which, I suppose, none that carefully compares the Apostle's account of them, with what is most notoriously

ously the conduct of the Papal hierarchy, can ever think them to be. But this I mention only as it were by the bye, and shall not enter further into the merits of it, as being not within the immediate design of this treatise.

But it may be asked, if this be what was intended, Why does the Apostle mention it as the number of the second beast; whereas it is rather of the first, since it was especially the use of the ancient Romans? To which I answer, that as the two beasts are indeed but one and the same people, under different administrations, the number of that people may be rightly said to be the number of both: especially since this way of numbering, tho' it was begun in the earlier ages, yet I suppose is not discontinued even to the present time. 'Tis possible indeed, that, in mercantile and literary affairs, they may now make use of the shorter, easier, and readier way of figures, that other nations do; but in other cases, particularly in matters relating to the Church, I do apprehend, that they do still make use of those very characters: and then it may still be said to be their number. And tho' the Apostle does seem to make some particular application of it to the second beast, yet when he sometimes calls it the number of his name, it seems very evident that he

does not mean it to be particularly the number of the second, but in general of that people, whose different states are here described under the characters of the first and second beast.

And now I conceive, that I have very clearly counted the number of the beast in his own proper numerals; a method that I take to be entirely new. But whether it is so or not, I cannot pretend to be certain: all I can say is, that it is truly so to me; I never saw nor heard any thing of it, 'till I chanced to hit upon it in the manner as has been above related. But if it be indeed new, it must need appear very astonishing, that, in the long space of almost seventeen hundred years, not one of all those pious, wise, and learned men, that have laboured diligently in this search, should have made any discovery of it, notwithstanding it appears now to be so rational and plain. But it is indeed possible, that the very plainness of it might have occasioned them to overlook it; they supposed it to intend somewhat very abstruse and puzzling, and therefore might more easily pass over what was plain and simple. But yet I cannot help thinking, that so extraordinary a circumstance must have had something providential in it; for tho'
the

the simplicity of it might naturally enough cause it to be overlooked for a while, yet that amidst all the attempts that have been made to solve the difficulty, no one should, in such a prodigious tract of time, take notice of this, tho' so very obvious; this is such a blindness, as I think could be owing to nothing else but this, that their eyes were holden that they should not see it, until the time appointed of the Father.

But indeed I have not read much upon the Subject, and therefore it is very possible that some others may have suggested the same thing before, altho' I know nothing of the matter. But I am the more inclined to think that it has not hitherto been observed, because it appears to me to give so satisfactory an account of the matter, that if it had been once known, I should imagine that we must have heard of it: the subsequent writers upon the subject, I think, could never pass it over in silence, and sure it could not be forgotten.

And since the thought has come into my mind, I have consulted Mr. Poole's *Synopsis Criticorum* upon the place, to see what the conjectures of the learned before his time have been concerning this matter: but amidst the various opinions that are set down there, I cannot find the least footsteps of this, nor

indeed any thing that seems to me at all satisfactory; the best, according to my judgment, being that before mentioned, founded in the word λατρευος: the rest, I think, is either nothing at all, or greatly strained and very far fetcht. Particularly it will not enter into my thoughts, that the Holy Spirit ever intended to require a skill in algebra, as necessary to the understanding of his mysteries, as some of those expositors seem to imagine. But what I am most of all surprized at is, that some of them think it not adviseable to make any enquiry at all concerning it, notwithstanding the Apostle in the very same place expressly notes it to *be wisdom* to find it out, and calls upon *him that hath understanding to count the number*. But it seems the difficulty of it was such, that they did not choose to meddle with it, and thought it their prudence to forbear it; and yet upon the footing here suggested, it seems quite easy, natural, and clear.

And here I cannot but admire, what I look upon as a very singular providence of God, in respect hereof; that whereas the numerals of other ancient nations are now no where to be found, but in the books that were formerly written in the languages of those nations, those of the Romans continue to be in use in some degree unto this day: and this

not

not only in Rome itself, or amongst the abettors of the Roman superstition, but amongst others also, as particularly amongst ourselves; who, upon diverse occasions, do even now make use of those very characters to express our numbers. As if God Almighty had, in a particular manner determined, that the numerals which contained this mystery, should be kept continually before our eyes, 'till the light should shine in our hearts to enable us to understand it. And tho' the matter may seem to be a little obscured, by the introduction of the M and D amongst those numerals; yet still the thing remains so clear, that it is beyond all dispute that the whole of their numbers in one, and that their most perfect way of numbering; and withal, as it should seem, the original, or at least the most approved and established manner of their computation, amounts to the number that the Apostle here speaks of; six hundred threescore and six.

But hitherto I have considered the number of the beast, only with regard to the manner of counting it: but in vain shall we think that we have succeeded in this, unless we are able to apply it also to the purpose for which it was intended.

Now

Now the design of the Apostle in so particularly describing this number, was not certainly to puzzle us without need; but the context plainly shews it to be, in order to our better understanding what he had mentioned in the preceding verse: where, speaking of the beast's tyranny, how he should debar all but his own votaries from the most common privileges, he says, that he would cause that *no one might buy or sell, save he that had the mark or the name of the beast, or the number of his name*: immediately upon which he adds, *here is wisdom; let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man, and his number is six hundred threescore and six*. Where therefore we may very plainly see, that he proposes this number to us, and exhorts us to search it out, in order to our distinguishing with greater certainty who it is he means by him that hath the number of the beast, or of the beast's name; for those appear plainly to be both the same thing.

As to the mark of the beast, he had given some hint concerning that in the 16th verse; where he had said of him, that *he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right-hand, or in their foreheads*; which seems to allude to a custom that was used in some coun-

countries, of putting a mark upon their slaves (as we do upon our sheep); to distinguish them, and to shew whom they belonged to: and this seems to be a sufficient intimation, that the mark of the beast is to be understood of something that was as a token of the subjection of the persons who had it, and shewed that they belonged to him.

And as to his name, every thing that pointed out to us what it was that was meant by the beast, did of course direct us to the knowledge of this. But for the number of his name, there was nothing yet to guide us to this; and therefore, that we might have something to go by in enquiring, and be in some sort enabled to discover who it is that hath it, he here tells us what the number is, and how much it amounts to.

And as this is the very end for which the number is propounded to us, it must plainly be in vain to count it, unless we can also apply it to this purpose, and find out by means hereof, who it is that hath the number. After tracing out the number therefore, with a seeming exactness, it will be proper to attempt this also, to try whether upon this plan, we can apply the number to the persons of whom it is spoken.

Now

Now if the Roman papacy be intended (as was hinted above) by the second beast, or eighth head, (which is what is spoken of in this place) then the expression "he that hath the number of the beast," must be supposed to be meant of one that acknowledges the Pope's authority, or is attached to his interest. And in all countries, I do apprehend, that those are constantly distinguished by the appellation of Papists, Romans, and Catholicks, or by one or more of those. Now the term Papist is a direct acknowledgment of their subjection to the Papacy; and so may be supposed to answer well enough to the mark of the beast. And as Rome is the seat of the papal power, and the Apostle's description of the beast has a very particular respect to that city, the term ROMAN may be justly thought to preserve his name.

And as in those two appellations they very clearly have the mark and name of the beast, so the other term CATHOLICK, with the help of a superstitious usage, that is in the greatest repute amongst them, and is constantly practised by every member of that communion, will, I suppose, be found to contain as fully the number of the beast, according to the foregoing count of it. For if you invert the second C, the Latin word

Catbo-

CatholIcus has all the Latin numerals, except the X; and this their frequent crossing themselves, which they regard as a most important ceremony of religion, may well be thought abundantly to supply. If therefore the number of the beast be indeed rightly counted thus, then the Romanists, by appropriating to themselves the term *CATHOLICK*, and making such use of the cross upon all occasions, have very plainly made this number applicable to themselves.

But it may be objected against the Latin term, that this is not in any where the appellation that is given to the Papists, but they are called in all countries according to the proper language of the country; and in Rome itself, it is not by the Latin, (which is out of date) but by the Italian name that they are called: and it is not pretended, that in any of those languages the name will answer to what we propose: In answer to which it must be said, that it cannot be thought necessary that it should be found thus in all languages; nay it must, I suppose, be very remarkable that it should be so in any one: but that it is so in the Latin is to be deemed more especially considerable, inasmuch as that was the language of that very people that made use of

G

those

those letters for their numerals : for if it is in their numerals that the number is found, the application of it must surely be most properly made in their language. And besides, if this be not at present the ordinary language of Rome, the seat of the beast, yet it was originally; and even now it is the language which the Romish church, all the adherents of the Pope in all the parts of the world, make use of in every thing relating to religion, in which the Pope's power is thought to be especially concerned : their Bible is in Latin, and their constitutions are penned in Latin, their prayers and missals are Latin, and all their sacred offices are performed in Latin, whether the people understand it or not : so that its being thus in the Latin, seems to be more to the purpose, than if it were so in any other language whatsoever.

If the inverting of the C be objected to, it must be said, that in order to the finding that character in any Roman word, this is what must necessarily be done ; there being no Roman letter directly in this form, nor any other but this, out of which it can be so conveniently framed : and if that character was at first made by such inverting of that letter, as was before shewn to be probable, and as must seem evident from the very

very form of it; I do not understand, why we may not be allowed the liberty to make use of the same method to find it out.

If it be said that there are two I's in the Roman numerals, and there is but one in *Catholicus*; my answer is, that tho' the I is there repeated, yet it is exactly the same in both places; and then I think there can be no need of two to answer to them; one being, I suppose, enough to all the intents and purposes of representing the same character, how often soever repeated.

But in opposition to this it may be said, Where then was the necessity of two C's to represent those letters? To which I answer, that the two C's are in two different forms in the numerals, and therefore it might seem necessary that there should be two to represent them, that the same might not be made to stand for the plain letter, and for the inverted one too: but the two I's being exactly the same, there cannot be supposed to be here the same necessity; the I alone properly notes number one; and then the C being inverted immediately after it, it may help again to make up the mark of five hundred, if that should be thought to be needful.

With regard to the V it may be said, that to make it serve our purpose we are

forced to change the letter ; for that the U in *Catholicus*, is not the same as is used for the numeral. But this is sufficiently answered, by saying that originally the letter was the same, as it is evident that in our dictionaries they are still considered as the same letter. It seems, indeed, that both V and U were in use with the Ancients ; but from Mr. Ainsworth's Account of the matter under this letter, I learn, that they had then both the same sound, and were each of them used indifferently, both for the vowel and the consonant ; and he expressly says, that *it was a late invention, that took from the former the vocal, and from the latter the consonant power* : so that tho' *Catholicus* be now necessarily wrote with U, yet in the writings of the Ancients it was wrote indifferently with either U or V.

But it may be further said, that the U is only found in the singular, and *Catholici* in the plural hath it not. But to this it is very easy to answer, that it does not signify any thing which number it is in ; the only question is, whether the term that is appropriated to the Papists really has those letters in it ; and if it has, I conceive it is of no consequence at all, whether it be in the singular or plural number that it has them. But besides, the Apostle expresses it in the singular

gular number, He that hath the number of the beast ; and to answer to this it must be *Catholicus*, as we have before used it.

And lastly with regard to the X, it may be said that a cross is not an X. But to this I answer, that that which is commonly called the St. Andrew's cross, is exactly in the form of an X : but whether that be the cross that the Papists mark themselves with, I cannot take upon me to say : it is the felicity of the country where I live, that there are no Popish inhabitants in it, at least that I know of ; but from hence it comes to pass, that I am quite unacquainted with their manner, and my neighbours, that I have consulted about it, can give me no certain account of the matter. But, however, if a cross more properly so called, be taken sideways, and a line was supposed to pass from one leg of it to the other, thus () it would have very much the form of an X ; at most the only difference betwixt them is, that in the X the two internal angles are acute, and the two external ones obtuse ; but in a cross, the two lines cut each other at right angles : but unless this be managed with great exactness, greater than it can well be supposed that they ever do it with, it is evident that it must decline into an X ; that is to say, the
two

two internal angles of it must be acute, and the two external ones obtuse.

But after all it may be said, that Catholick is a term, that in itself is applicable to every member of the catholick or universal church of Christ; and, that neither can the use of the cross be said to be peculiar to the Papists: and that, therefore, it does not seem right to appropriate this number to them, upon account of their use of those. But to this I answer, that however the term Catholick may be said to belong to all Christians, yet none lay any particular claim to it but the Papists, who are fond of distinguishing themselves by it upon all occasions, and will not allow the name to belong to any others, as boasting themselves to be the only true church of Christ. And as to the cross, there are none, at least in this western part of the world, that lay any stress upon the sign, or that can be said to use it any way superstitiously, but themselves only; or if there be in any part of the world any that do so, yet the number is not contained in the sign of the cross alone, but in conjunction with the term Catholick; and as there are certainly no others but the Papists, that are distinguished by both those, it must I conceive be justly said that the number, as contained in those,

those, is truly applicable to them, and to no other.

But what right have we to tack the usage to the appellation, in order to make out the number? If all the characters had been found in the term alone, it would have looked somewhat plausible; but, when this was defective, to catch at a silly custom of theirs to fill up what is wanting, looks as if we were determined to fix the number on them at any rate.

In answer to which it must be said, that if there was any straining of the matter in any wise in order to make it bear, there might be some room for this way of reasoning; if I had said that they had I in their image worship, V in their respect for the Virgin Mary, X in their crucifixes, L in their legends, C in the term catholic, and IO in transubstantiation, it might have looked as if I had resolved to find the number upon them some way or other; for after much the same manner, I suppose, it may be made applicable to any people whatsoever: but here the case is very different, the application of it to them is made only in their most noted distinctions, and is quite natural and obvious: they have the X as manifestly in the usage, as the other characters in the appellation; and they are
as

as remarkable for the custom, as for the name : as catholick is the favourite title, so crossing themselves is the principal use by which they are distinguished ; what they practise upon all occasions, day and night continually. They have, therefore, as just a claim to the X in respect of the one, as to the other characters in respect of the other ; and then to find fault with it, because of the difference of the manner, is what I think we can have no right to do : must it not be taking too much upon us to pretend to determine in what manner the number ought to be found applicable to them ? All that the text says, is, that they shall have the number ; but the manner of their having it is left at large for us to investigate ; and we should, in all reason, be content to take that as we happen to find it : if it be made appear, that they are in any way truly distinguished by the characters that together make up this number, that is certainly enough for the completion of the prophecy : and therefore whether it be made out altogether in the same way, or partly in one respect, and partly in another, this can be nothing at all to the purpose ; between them both they have the full number, and that is all that is wanted : and then to cavil at a mere circumstance

re-

relating to it, is in effect to say, that tho' we cannot deny but they have the number, yet because they have it not in the manner that we expect, or think proper, therefore they really have it not.

This then, I presume, must appear to be an easy, rational, and just application of the number, when counted after this manner, to those very persons whom the context seems plainly to point to, as having it. And this I take to be a good presumptive argument, that it has been rightly counted.

As far as I have observed, every thing that has hitherto been proposed upon this head, has been utterly incapable of such application : however well it might seem to answer to the number given, it still fell short in respect of the end for which it was given ; it could not be applied to the persons before described. Indeed with regard to the word *λατῖνος*, if that could be the number of the beast, it might be said that every Latin had in some sort the number, it being plainly contained in their Greek appellative. But I do not apprehend that Latin was ever a term appropriated to the Papists : indeed the Western churches were sometimes stiled the Latin churches ; but this not from their subjection to the Pope, but in contradistinction to the Greek Churches, by which title the

H

East-

Eastern ones were distinguished : and so the Fathers also of the Western church are called the Latin Fathers, because they generally wrote in Latin, as those of the Eastern church did in Greek : but I do not know that the members of the Roman communion were ever specified under this name, or that a Latin was at all thought to imply any subjection to the See of Rome. If therefore the papacy be this beast, that a Latin may be said to have the number, is nothing at all to the purpose, since no adherents of the Pope were ever particularly distinguished by that name.

And as for the other schemes that have been offered, they do not, I suppose, give the least light to this matter ; but the patrons of them (by what I can learn from Mr. Poole) either conclude that having the mark, and name, and number of the beast, is all but one and the same thing, contrary to what, I think, the disjunctive placed between them seems to imply ; or else interpret the having this number in such a manner, as plainly shews they do not know what to make of it : 'tis something relating to the Impiety, Idolatry, or the like of the Romans ; but they never pretend to apply their manner of counting it, to the discovering who has it.

And as the Plan that is here laid down for counting it, answers fully to this purpose, when

when all the others have been so manifestly defective in respect hereof, this, I humbly conceive, must be at least an argument that this is more to the purpose than any of them.

And tho' I dare not say, that no other scheme can so well answer hereunto, and consequently that this must absolutely be right; yet since the Spirit of God has directed us to a certain mark for finding out who has the number, we may, I think, not unreasonably suppose, that the criterion is such as can never be counterfeited throughout: and therefore that the number proposed is, according to this way of counting it, so plainly applicable to that set of people that seems to be there particularly intended, must, I suppose, be a strong presumption that this is indeed the true way of doing it.

And now if the number be rightly counted thus, and if this application of it be just, it must needs be a very plain proof of the spirit of prophecy in the writing of this book: and therefore must greatly tend to encourage our hope and confident expectation, that all the predictions therein contained, shall be fulfilled in their season.

For tho' it be possible that St. John might point to this number of the beast from his own personal knowledge of the matter, these numerals of the Romans being, as I conceive, the same as were in use with them in his

time ; yet that he should be able to foretel so long before there was the least appearance of it, that there should arise a set of people professing subjection to, and depending on a power in Rome, who should be in a particular manner distinguished by those numerals, (which in the effect has accordingly happened, this very people appropriating to themselves a name, that has in it almost all those numerals, in the best manner that any name can have them, and fully supplying what is wanting in it, by a superstitious usage that they are above all others especially fond of) this I say can be owing to nothing else but the inspiration of God.

And here we may also see a very important reason, why it hath pleased the divine wisdom to keep this matter so long in obscurity. If the abettors of the papal power had been aware of this, that the Roman numerals were indeed the number of the beast, it is beyond all doubt, that they would have taken care not to distinguish themselves by any matters, that should have made that number applicable unto them ; but while this was not so much as thought of, they have unawares to themselves fulfilled the prophecy, and assumed that very number which they were most of all concerned to avoid. And as all the other parts of the description seemed before to agree well enough to them, they have
hereby

hereby proved, I suppose undeniably, that the marks do all truly and properly belong unto them, and that therefore they are indeed the very persons there pointed to.

I have now propounded every thing that I think material, which has occurred to me upon this subject, and have laboured according to my ability to illustrate it. I know not what others may happen to think of it, but to me the thing appears in a very clear and convincing light, or else I should not have presumed to trouble the publick with it. Yet I cannot pretend to say, but the favourable opinion which I have of it, may be owing only to that fondness which we naturally have for our own productions. I therefore gladly submit it to the examination of others, who are better, and it may be more impartial judges of the matter than myself.

When the thought first presented itself to me, I took the liberty to communicate it in a long letter to an old friend of mine of note in the University, in hopes that I might have had from him the sense of the learned in that place upon it. Indeed I had not then thoroughly digested it, but I put together the substance of it in such manner as it then occurred to me, and waited for an answer. But when several months had passed, and no manner

ner of answer was vouchsafed to my letter, I then took a resolution, in confidence of my own judgment, to venture upon the publication of it. But here again I was for some time much discouraged by the answer of a very worthy clergyman in the country, to whom I had sent a short sketch of my plan for his opinion of it, who told me that really he did not understand me, nor could tell what I would be at. Whether I was too concise in the account that I gave him of it, or what it was I cannot tell; but this reply occasioned me to suspect, that however plain it appeared to me, yet the scheme was really an unintelligible one; and thereupon for some time I thought it would be best entirely to lay aside my design.* But when some other of my learned friends, to whom I had a better opportunity of communicating my thoughts more at large, assured me, that they very plainly perceived what it was that I intended, (as it was evident to me they did, from the conversation they afterwards held with me about it) and that they thought it to be at least as probable a scheme as any that they had met with, then I thought proper

* I have lately had an opportunity of talking with this Gentleman, and had the pleasure to make him fully apprehend my meaning. And tho' I cannot boast that he approved my scheme, yet it was a satisfaction to me, that he had no objection to make against it, but what is here propounded, and I think fully answered.

per to resume my former resolution of publishing it.

But whatever opinion I have of it, it is very possible it may be condemned by the world. It is indeed but too common with men to look upon this as an impenetrable mystery, which no one here can attain unto; and upon this footing every thing that can be produced upon this head, must be condemned; for if it be what no one can discover, then all the pretensions to it must be vain.

But if this was indeed the case, why should the Apostle call upon us to count the number? or how could he propose to make us understand who has it, by the help of this description of it? upon the supposition that it is beyond our reach, both these must needs be absurd. The condemning it therefore thus in the lump, is what I must look upon as nothing; but if, by any substantial reason, it can be shewed that it is inconsistent with, or does not answer to the Apostle's account of the matter, or the like, then I shall be very content to yield it up. For my part I have urged every thing that I have to say in its behalf, and endeavoured to obviate every objection that I thought could be made against it: if any thing new be started, that I was not aware of, I cannot say that I shall be able to answer it, or to do any thing more to
sup-

support my hypothesis, if what I have already offered be not sufficient for that purpose.

But if on the other side, it should receive the approbation of wise and good men, it will no doubt be a great pleasure to me to be the instrument of a discovery, that I think may, and I hope will, thro' the blessing of God, turn to the encrease and benefit of his Church.

But yet I cannot pretend to lay claim to any merit upon account thereof. If it has cost me a little pains to clear it up, and to confirm it, yet the discovery of it scarce cost me any at all : and I am sure, I can make no pretensions to any sagacity or quickness of parts superior to any of my neighbours. All that can be said is, it is God that giveth wisdom ; and *those things which he keepeth hidden from the wise and prudent, he is pleased many times to reveal unto babes, even as it seemeth good in his sight ; chusing the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty, that no flesh should glory in his presence.*

If therefore what I have offered be right, let God be praised for it, of whose only gift it cometh ; and to him be rendered all glory and honour for ever. *Amen.*

F I N I S.